DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 306 424 CE 052 396

TITLE	The Senior Community Service Employment Program: Its History and Evolution. A Report by the National Council on the Aging to the Chairman of the Select Committee on Aging. House of Representatives, One Hundredth Congress, Second Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Select Committee on Aging.
REPORT NO	House-Comm-Pub-100-695
PUB DATE	Dec 88
NOTE	29p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Services; *Disadvantaged; *Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Job Training; Minority Groups; *Older Adults; Outcomes of Education; *Program Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 100th; *Older Americans Act 1965; Older Workers; *Senior Community Service Employment Program

ABSTRACT

The Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP)--now Title V of the Older Americans Act--evolved from Operation Mainstream, a pilot project established under Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act. Operation Mainstream, which was first funded in 1965, provided jobs for chronically unemployed, poor adults in a wide range of activities to improve the social and physical environment primarily in rural areas. Older adults were one of the target groups to be served by Operation Mainstream. Operation Mainstream's older worker component was converted from a pilot project into a national, ongoing program when the 1973 Older Americans Comprehensive Services Amendments became law. It was officially designated as the Older Americans Community Service Employment Act (Title IX of the 1973 Older Americans Comprehensive Services Amendments). Throughout its history, the SCSEP has served some of the most disadvantaged persons in society, particularly those with poverty incomes, limited education, and minority status. Numerous evaluations of SCSEP and its predecessor--the Mainstream Older Workers pilot project--have shown them to be very effective programs that should be retained and strengthened. (Author/KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED306424

COMMITTEE PRINT

THE SENIOR COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM: ITS HISTORY AND EVOLUTION

A REPORT

BY THE

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE AGING

TO THE

CHAIRMAN

OF THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON AGING
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDREDTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

DECEMBER 1988

Comm. Pub. No. 100-695

Printed for the use of the Select Committee on Aging

This document has been printed for informational purposes only. It does not represent either findings or recommendations adopted by this Committee.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
92-198 ≈ WASHINGTON : 1989

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

ED052396

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON AGING

EDWARD R. ROYBAL, California, *Chairman*

CLAUDE PEPPER, Florida
DON BONKER, Washington
THOMAS J. DOWNEY, New York
JAMES J. FLORIO, New Jersey
HAROLD E. FORD, Tennessee
WILLIAM J. HUGHES, New Jersey
MARILYN LLOYD, Tennessee
MARY ROSE OAKAR, Ohio
THOMAS A. LUKEN, Ohio
BEVERLY B. BYRON, Maryland
HENRY A. WAXMAN, California
MIKE SYNAR, Oklahoma
BUTLER DERRICK, South Carolina
BRUCE F. VENTO, Minnesota
BARNEY FRANK, Massachusetts
TOM LANTOS, California
RON WYDEN, Oregon
GEO. W. CROCKETT, JR., Michigan
IKE SKELTON, Missouri
DENNIS M. HERTEL, Michigan
ROBERT A. BORSKI, Pennsylvania
RICK BOUCHER, Virginia
BEN ERDREICH, Alabama
BUDDY MacKAY, Florida
NORMAN SISISKY, Virginia
ROBERT E. WISE, JR., West Virginia
BILL RICHARDSON, New Mexico
HAROLD L. VOLKMER, Missouri
BART GORDON, Tennessee
THOMAS J. MANTON, New York
TOMMY F. ROBINSON, Arkansas
RICHARD H. STALLINGS, Idaho
JAMES McCLURE CLARKE, North Carolina
JOSEPH P. KENNEDY II, Massachusetts
LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER, New York
JAMES H. BILBRAY, Nevada
JAMES JONTZ, Indiana
JERRY F. COSTELLO, Illinois

MATTHEW J. RINALDO, New Jersey,
Ranking Minority Member
JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, Arkansas
RALPH REGULA, Ohio
NORMAN D. SHUMWAY, California
OLYMPIA J. SNOWE, Maine
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
GEORGE C. WORTLEY, New York
JIM COURTER, New Jersey
CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER, Rhode Island
THOMAS J. RIDGE, Pennsylvania
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT, New York
JIM SAXTON, New Jersey
HELEN DELICH BENTLEY, Maryland
JIM LIGHTFOOT, Iowa
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
JAN MEYERS, Kansas
BEN BLAZ, Guam
PATRICK L. SWINDALL, Georgia
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
BILL SCHUETTE, Michigan
FLOYD SPENCE, South Carolina
WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR. Pennsylvania
CONSTANCE A. MORELLA, Maryland
PATRICIA F. SAIKI, Hawaii

MANUEL R. MIRANDA, PH.D., *Staff Director*
PAUL SCHLEGEL, *Minority Staff Director*

(II)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FOREWORD

The value and worth of the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP)—now Title V of the Older Americans Act—and its predecessor, Operation Mainstream, have been amply demonstrated over the years. Throughout its history, Title V has enabled low-income older Americans to help themselves while helping others in their communities.

This fulfilling work experience has also produced another benefit for older workers—a means to learn new skills to move into gainful and productive employment in the private sector. National aging organizations and States have successfully implemented this objective while serving some of the most disadvantaged members of our society in terms of educational attainment, economic status, and outmoded work skills.

Title V is truly a success story, in large part because the legislation creating the SCSEP—the Older American Community Service Employment Act—was carefully crafted. The House Select Committee on Aging is proud of its role in contributing to the evolution and development of the SCSEP.

When the concept of an older worker community service employment pilot project first emerged in 1965, there were those who wondered whether it would have sufficient appeal for elderly Americans. Today—nearly a quarter of a century later—the verdict is clear beyond any reasonable doubt. Older Americans are enthusiastic about participating in community service employment programs as a dignified means to improve their economic well-being in fulfilling and purposeful activity.

1988 is a year of important anniversaries for the SCSEP. It marks the 15th anniversary of the Older American Community Service Employment Act. Its the 20th anniversary for the National Council on the Aging (NCOA) and the National Council of Senior Citizens (NCSC) community service employment programs, which first began as older workers pilot projects in 1968 under Operation Mainstream. And, 1988 is the tenth anniversary for the three national minority aging organizations—National Association for Hispanic Elderly (NAHE), National Caucus and Center on Black Aged (NCBA), and National Urban League (NUL)—which have contributed greatly to the SCSEP's rich history.

It is altogether fitting and proper to take stock of the history and evolution of the SCSEP, especially as our Nation prepares for the next White House Conference on Aging in 1991. This report prepared by the Title V national sponsors—NCOA, NAHE, NCBA, NUL, NCSC, American Association of Retired Persons, and Green Thumb—provides a solid foundation for lawmakers, congressional staff, practitioners in the field of aging, employment specialists,

and others in understanding key concepts which have made Title V an extraordinarily effective program.

Once again, the House Select Committee on Aging wishes to express its sincere appreciation to the SCSEP national sponsors for providing this useful document for improving public understanding about the SCSEP.

EDWARD R. ROYBAL, *Chairman.*

ABSTRACT

The Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP)—now Title V of the Older Americans Act—evolved from Operation Mainstream, a pilot project established under Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act. Operation Mainstream, which was first funded in 1965, provided jobs for chronically unemployed, poor adults in a wide range of activities to improve the social and physical environment primarily in rural areas. Older Americans were one of the target groups to be served by Operation Mainstream.

Operation Mainstream's older worker component was, in effect, converted from a pilot project into a national, ongoing program when the 1973 Older Americans Comprehensive Services Amendments became law (Public Law 93-29). It was officially designated as the Older American Community Service Employment Act (Title IX of the 1973 Older Americans Comprehensive Services Amendments). The 1978 Comprehensive Older Americans Act Amendments (Public Law 95-478) redesignated the SCSEP as Title V of the Older Americans Act.

Throughout its history, the SCSEP has served some of the most disadvantaged persons in our entire society, particularly those with poverty incomes, limited educational attainment, and minorities. About 4 out of 5 (80.4 percent) enrollees had incomes below the poverty guidelines during the 1987-88 program year. A large proportion of the enrollees had limited education—49.1 percent did not graduate from high school, and 27.8 percent completed less than 9 years of schooling. Nearly 3 out of every 8 (37.2 percent) enrollees were members of minority groups during the 1987-88 program year. The proportion of minority participants has grown steadily during the 1980's, from 32.7 percent for the 1980-81 program year to 37.2 percent for the most recent period.

The SCSEP and its predecessor—the Mainstream Older Worker pilot project—have been evaluated on numerous occasions. Both programs always received high marks, whether from independent evaluators, elderly participants, host agencies, or others. For example, Solomon G. Jacobson, a Vice President for Morgan Management Systems, Inc., testified before the Human Services Subcommittee of the House Committee on Aging: "The Senior Community Service Employment Program is the most effective program I have ever evaluated, and in my opinion it should be retained and strengthened."

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	iii
Abstract	v
Chapter One	
History, Origins, and Underlying Concepts	1
A. A National Senior Service Corps	1
B. OEO and the War on Poverty	4
C. Middle-Aged and Older Workers Full Employment Act	4
D. Older American Community Service Employment Act	6
E. Authorization Struggles	8
1. Action in 1970	8
2. Action in 92nd Congress (1971–72)	9
3. Enactment in 1973	10
F. Appropriations Issues	11
G. Issues During the 1980's	13
Chapter Two	
Characteristics of the SCSEP	14
Sex	14
Minorities	14
Poverty Status	14
Education	15
Age	15
Veterans	15
Unsubsidized Placements	15
Administrative Costs	16
Chapter Three	
Assessment of the SCSEP	17
Elderly Participants	17
Host Agencies	17
Independent Evaluators	18
Federal Council on the Aging Report	18
Morgan Management Systems, Inc. Report for the FCA	18
General Accounting Office (GAO) Study	18
Centaur Associates, Inc. Study	19
Borzilleri Study for American Association of Retired Persons	19

APPENDIX

Appendix A. Year Current Sponsors Were First Funded Under Either Operation Mainstream or the SCSEP	21
Appendix B. Legislation Creating or Amending the SCSEP	22

CHAPTER ONE

HISTORY, ORIGINS, AND UNDERLYING CONCEPTS

The Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP)—now Title V of the Older Americans Act—evolved from Operation Mainstream, a pilot project established under Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act (Public Law 89-253) and first funded in 1965. Operation Mainstream provided job opportunities for chronically unemployed, poor adults in a wide range of activities to improve the social and physical environment primarily in rural areas. Older Americans were one of the target groups to be served by Operation Mainstream.

The administration of Operation Mainstream was transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) to the Department of Labor (DoL) in 1967. However, the funding authority remained with OEO.

Operation Mainstream's older worker component was, in effect, converted from a pilot project into a categorical ongoing program when the 1973 Older Americans Comprehensive Services Amendments became law (Public Law 93-29). It was officially designated as the Older American Community Service Employment Act (Title IX of the 1973 Older Americans Comprehensive Services Amendments). The 1978 Comprehensive Older Americans Act Amendments (Public Law 95-478) redesignated the SCSEP as Title V of the Older Americans Act.

A. A National Senior Service Corps

Green Thumb was the first older worker pilot project funded under Operation Mainstream. It was launched during 1965 with 280 enrollees in four States: Arkansas, Minnesota, New Jersey, and Oregon.

The National Farmers Union sponsored Green Thumb, which provided older, low-income rural persons with a broad range of service opportunities. Most projects initially involved beautification and improvement of publicly owned areas, including parks, the restoration of historical sites, and the development of recreational areas.

The U.S. Senate Committee on Aging provided much of the impetus and leadership to build upon Operation Mainstream. On February 4, 1966, Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr. (D-NJ) sponsored S. 2877, which would amend the 1965 Older Americans Act to establish a National Community Senior Service Corps. Shortly thereafter, Senator George A. Smathers (D-FL) introduced (on May 9, 1966) S. 3326 to amend the Older Americans Act to establish a Talented American Senior Corps.

S. 2877 would authorize the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (now Health and Human Services) to assist State Agencies on Aging in developing programs to provide part-time employment for persons 60 and older. This legislation had three major objectives: (1) to enable older Americans to earn additional income, (2) to provide an opportunity to engage in purposeful activity, and (3) to provide needed services in communities where aged persons reside.

S. 3326 would authorize the Department of HEW to establish a Talented American Senior Service Corps to enlist persons 55 years of age or older to provide a wide range of services, including portable meals and other services for the homebound; assistance in schools, hospitals, and other institutions; beautification of highways and public areas; and home repairs.

Hearings were held on S. 2877 and S. 3326 by the Special Subcommittee on Aging of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee on May 24, 25, and June 15, 1966. However, the 89th Congress did not act on either bill.

Senator Williams reintroduced (on January 12, 1967) his National Community Senior Service Corps legislation as S. 276 during the 90th Congress. The Labor and Public Welfare Special Subcommittee on Aging held hearings on S. 276 on September 17 and 18, 1967.

Both the 1966 and 1967 hearings provided support for the concept of a national senior service corps. However, key witnesses urged that employment aspects of a service program should be under the direction of DoL. Projects involving unpaid volunteers, witnesses generally agreed, could be under HEW.

Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz testified that "there is a crying need in people's lives for continuing 'social opportunity' and for the need to be useful as well as to be secure."[1] He disagreed, though, with the provision to place the service corps under the direction of HEW. He maintained that DoL already had sufficient authority to fund the programs which S. 276 sought to establish.

On February 15, 1968, President Lyndon B. Johnson and Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz announced at a White House ceremony the awarding of two new contracts to the National Council on the Aging (NCOA) and the National Council of Senior Citizens (NCSC) to establish an Older American Community Service Program on a demonstration basis.

NCOA received $1,051,411 to establish community senior service pilot projects in 10 localities. NCSC was awarded $1,129,520 to develop senior aides programs in 10 communities to provide socially useful part-time jobs for low-income jobless persons 55 years or older.

DoL also renewed the contract with Green Thumb at this ceremony. Secretary Wirtz gave this rationale for the three contracts:

> Our senior citizens don't want handouts. They want work. They want to continue to make a contribution to their fellow man. They want to continue to be a vital and living part of American society.[2]

---

[1] "Developments in Aging 1967", A Report of the Special Committee on Aging, U.S. Senate, April 29, 1968, p. 35.

[2] "Developments in Aging 1967", A Report of the Special Committee on Aging, U.S. Senate, April 29, 1968, p. 206.

The American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) became a new sponsor in 1969. Five national older worker pilot projects existed under Operation Mainstream during fiscal year 1969, providing employment opportunities for approximately 4,400 enrollees.

Sponsor	Authorized Funds	Positions
National Farmers Union	$5,200,000	2,314
(Green Thumb)	(4,700,000)	(2,044)
(Green Light)[1]	(500,000)	(270)
NCSC	3,200,000	1,132
NCOA	2,300,000	500
AARP	738,000	313
Virginia State College	320,000	*115
Totals	11,758,000	4,374

[1] During fiscal year 1969, the National Farmers Union operated Green Thumb and Green Light. Both programs provided community service employment for low-income older persons. Green Thumb served rural aged men, and Green Light assisted rural older women. Green Light was later merged with Green Thumb.

[2] "Developments in Aging 1969". A Report of the Special Committee on Aging, U.S. Senate, May 15, 1970, p. 133.

NOTE: Please refer to page 14 for a discussion of subsequent program expansion which added three minority sponsors and State sponsors.

Throughout this period, the Senate Committee on Aging took the lead in urging establishment of a national senior service corps. The committee's 1968 annual report, for example, made this recommendation:

> The soundness of the concept of community service by older Americans—either as paid participants or as volunteers—has been amply demonstrated in many promising pilot programs. The committee renews its recommendation that advantage be taken of the lessons learned within recent years, and that a comprehensive national program—using all available resources at Federal, State, and local levels—be considered by the Congress and enacted into law at the earliest possible date.[3]

By 1969, Congress accepted the recommendations of key leaders in the field of aging that HEW should be responsible for volunteer service programs, and DoL should have jurisdiction over employment programs. The 1969 Older Americans Act Amendments (Public Law 91-69) created a new Title VI National Older American Volunteer Program, which provided for the transfer of the Foster Grandparent program from OEO to the Administration on Aging (AoA). Title VI also added a new Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP), which would utilize older Americans in counseling and tutoring children, rendering services in hospitals and nursing homes, and providing other necessary services. Foster Grandparents and RSVP were later transferred to Action, an agency established to administer volunteer programs.

B. OEO AND THE WAR ON POVERTY

Another important development during the mid and late 1960's, which helped to shape what eventually became the SCSEP, was the OEO war on poverty. The 1965 OEO Amendments (Public Law 89-

[3] "Developments in Aging 1968", A Report of the Special Committee on Aging, U.S. Senate, April 3, 1969, p. 76.

253) added a new section for programs for the elderly poor. This measure called upon OEO "to consider the special problems of the elderly poor . . . in the development, conduct, and administration of programs."[4]

OEO initially undertook four major programs and activities to implement this measure:

1. A *Foster Grandparent Program* to utilize low-income persons 55 years of age or older to provide services for disadvantaged children.
2. A *Home Health Aides Program* to recruit and train persons 45 years or older to be members of health service teams, offering extended medical care in the homes of the needy. These aides provided unskilled nursing tasks, homemaker services, and shopping assistance.
3. *Medicare Alert* to inform the elderly poor about Medicare and other new benefits available for low-income older Americans.
4. *Project Green Thumb* which employed low-income rural persons in highway beautification and other activities.

C. Middle-Aged and Older Workers Full Employment Act

A series of hearings by the Senate Committee on Aging's Subcommittee on Employment and Retirement Incomes (Senator Jennings Randolph, D-WV, chairman) and the Subcommittee on Federal, State, and Community Services (Senator Edward M. Kennedy, D-MA, chairman) paved the way for the introduction of the Middle-Aged and Older Workers Full Employment Act (S. 4180) on October 10, 1968.[5] Congressman James H. Scheuer (D-NY) sponsored a companion bill, H.R. 20429.

Key provisions in the Middle-Aged and Older Workers Full Employment Act included:

—Establishment of a Midcareer Development Services program at the DoL to provide (1) training to upgrade the work skills and capabilities of persons 45 years of age or older; (2) training of individuals to train and retrain older workers in skills needed in the economy; (3) special services to assist unemployed middle-aged and older workers because of a mass layoff; and (4) midcareer counseling services for persons 45 or older who are unemployed and seeking work. This legislation also directed DoL to conduct a study to determine whether the Manpower Development and Training Act and other federally assisted programs were responsive to the needs of persons 45 or older. (Title II of S. 4180/H.R. 20429)

—Establishment of a program for job opportunities for older Americans with Federal contractors. DoL would be authorized to make arrangements for appropriate training of older workers when the manpower requirements of a Federal contract may not be readily met by present employees of a contractor

[4] "Developments in Aging 1965", A Report of the Special Committee on Aging, U.S. Senate, March 15, 1966, p. 13.

[5] "Adequacy of Services for Older Workers", July 24, 25, and 29, 1968.

or subcontractor. Additionally, DoL could make special provision through the Federal-State employment service to fund nonprofit volunteer agencies to register, counsel, select, and refer older workers for part-time or temporary employment. (Part A of Title III of S. 4180/H.R. 20429)

—A program for useful part-time work opportunities in community services for workers who have retired or have difficulty in securing employment in the competitive labor market because of age. This program would be under the direction of DoL. (Part B of Title III of S. 4180/H.R. 20429)

—A series of studies to expand opportunities for employment, education, and flexible retirement. One example was a study to determine the feasibility and advisability of providing transitional allowances for unemployed workers 55 to 64 years old who have (1) inadequate financial resources, (2) exhausted their unemployment compensation, and (3) no prospects for employment. (Title IV of S. 4180/H.R. 20429)

—A study by the Civil Service Commission (now, the Office of Personnel Management) concerning part-time employment in the executive branch and the feasibility of redesigning positions in the executive branch to increase subprofessional employment opportunities for older persons. The Commission was further directed to undertake special work and training programs to provide low-income, unemployed persons 45 or older with job opportunities in the executive branch with maximum prospects for advancement and continued employment. (Title VI of S. 4180/H.R. 20429)

Louis H. Ravin, Special Assistant for Older Workers at DoL, testified at these hearings that several clearly discernible trends become evident for persons upon reaching age 45. He said:

> . . . In fact, beginning about age 45:
> —labor force participation falls off;
> —unemployment begins to rise;
> —duration of unemployment increases; and
> —poverty increases.[6]

No action could be taken during the 90th Congress on S. 4180/H.R. 20429 because Congressional sponsors introduced the legislation shortly before adjournment. The purpose was to place the measure before the public for analysis and input.

A tactical decision was made during the 91st Congress to divide the Middle-Aged and Older Workers Full Employment Act into two parts. The community service employment aspect would be introduced by Senator Kennedy, and the training and other related features would be included in a bill to be sponsored by Senator Randolph.

Both Senators were strategically placed to move the legislation, since they served on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee (now, the Labor and Human Resources Committee), which had legislative jurisdiction over employment and training bills. Senator Kennedy was also, at that time, chairman of the Special Subcom-

[6] "Developments in Aging 1968", A Report of the Special Committee on Aging, U.S. Senate, April 3, 1969, p. 60.

mittee on Aging of the Labor and Human Resources Committee. This subcommittee would be the initial forum in the Senate for considering any community service employment legislation.

Thus, key Members from the Senate Committee on Aging and the Labor and Pubic Welfare Committee had opted for a two-track strategy to move an older worker community service employment program and a middle-aged and older worker training component through the 92nd Congress (1969–70). Strategists initially believed that it would be easier to advance the proposals separately.

Moreover, they sought separate programs for middle-aged and older persons because it was generally believed by leaders in the field of aging that mature persons 45 or older were often overlooked or ignored by general work and training programs. For example, only 4 percent of all enrollees in Federal manpower programs in fiscal year 1970 were 45 years of age or older.

First-Time Enrollment in Manpower Programs in Fiscal Year 1970 [Figures in Thousands][1]

	Total	Under Age 22		Age 45 or Older	
		Percent	Number	Percent	Number
Total, All Programs	1,051.4	68	716.8	4	46.3
Manpower Development & Training Act					
Institutional	130.0	37	48.1	9	11.7
OJT	91.0	35	31.9	11	10.0
Job Opportunities in the Business Sector	86.8	47	40.8	4	3.5
Concentrated Employment Program	110.1	41	45.1	8	8.8
Work Incentive Program	92.7	23	21.3	6	5.6
Operation Mainstream	12.5	4	5.0	51	6.4
New Careers	3.6	21	0.8	7	0.3
Youth Programs					
Neighborhood Youth Corps					
In-school	74.4	100	74.4	-	---
Out-of-school	46.2	98	45.3	-	---
Summer	361.5	100	361.5	-	---
Job Corps	42.6	100	42.6	-	---

[1] "Developments in Aging 1970", A Report of the Special Committee on Aging, U.S. Senate, March 23, 1971, p.93

D. Older American Community Service Employment Act

Staff for the Senate Committee on Aging worked with leaders in the field of aging, employment specialists, and government administrators during the 91st Congress (1969–70) to develop (1) a SCSEP and (2) a Middle-Aged and Older Workers Training program.[7] Important concepts and statutory language were lifted from S. 4180/H.R. 20429. However, the task force did modify the bill both for substantive and tactical purposes.

Senator Edward Kennedy introduced the Older American Community Service Employment Act (OACSEA) on March 18, 1970. S. 3604 authorized DoL to enter into agreements with private, nonprofit organizations or State or local governmental units to promote community service employment opportunities for unemployed low-income persons 55 years of age or older who have poor employ-

[7] The Senate Committee on Aging is a fact-finding committee. It does not have legislative jurisdiction.

ment prospects. S. 3604 included many requirements that are now incorporated in the law. Its major objective was to build upon Mainstream's excellent track record and convert the older worker pilot projects into permanent, ongoing national programs.

Senator Kennedy gave this rationale:

> The enthusiastic acceptance of these programs . . . strongly suggests that there are many low-income older persons and retirees in virtually every community willing and able to perform services. Greater utilization of their talents, experience, and knowledge would benefit not only the elderly job seeker, but the general community as well.
>
> Present programs, however, are still very limited. A more comprehensive approach is needed to provide increased opportunities for community services by older persons.[8]

S. 3604 had several important objectives. First, the bill had an income maintenance component. It was structured to help disadvantaged persons (i.e., unemployed low-income persons 55 or older who have poor employment prospects) who would not be good candidates for private sector employment (such as low-income elderly widows who may not have worked for 30 or 40 years or limited English-speaking persons with very low levels of educational attainment).

Second, S. 3604 was to provide a wide range of services to communities which would not otherwise be available without the OACSEA.

Third, it offered low-income older persons a meaningful opportunity to engage in purposeful activity.

Fourth, the bill was to assist, when appropriate, older enrollees in becoming employed in the private sector. This was emphasized by the part-time nature of the employment. The architects of the OACSEA believed that part-time employment would provide an incentive for older persons who wanted to work full time to seek employment in the private sector.

However, it should be emphasized at the outset that the OACSEA was initially more of an income maintenance program than a training program. The Randolph bill (the Middle-Aged and Older Workers Training program) was to provide training and related services for persons 45 or older who had better prospects of obtaining employment in the private sector. S. 3604 was to provide employment for low-income older Americans who would have a very difficult time in obtaining private sector employment. The authors clearly hoped that these individuals would eventually be able to move into private sector employment because of their work experience and training from the SCSEP.

Although S. 3604 did not contain a statutory requirement that older enrollees should be transitioned into private industry, this placement objective (initially 10 percent, later 15 percent, and now 20 percent) was developed in regulations by DoL. The goal of transitioning older enrollees into the private sector received greater attention after the OACSEA became law, and the Congress failed to enact the Middle-Aged and Older Workers Training bill. Through

[8] Congressional Record—Senate, March 18, 1970, p. 7805.

the years, the focus of the SCSEP has increasingly shifted from income maintenance to training and transitioning older workers into private industry.

E. Authorization Struggles

The stage was now set for Congressional sponsors to move forward with the OACSEA and the Middle-Aged and Older Workers Training program.

1. *Action in 1970:* The Randolph proposal was added as an amendment (Middle-Aged and Older Workers Employment Act Amendment) to the Employment and Training Opportunities Act, S. 3867, in 1970. S. 3867 passed the Senate on September 17, 1970, by a vote of 68 to 6.[9]

The House-passed Comprehensive Manpower Act (H.R. 19515) did not include the special emphasis provisions for middle-aged and older persons and other target groups that were in the Senate-passed bill. House and Senate conferees later agreed to keep the Senate provisions for mature workers largely intact, including the following:

—Creation of a Midcareer Development Services program at DoL to help individuals 45 and above secure employment through training, counseling, and other necessary services.

—Directed DoL to designate full-time personnel experienced with middle aged and older workers employment problems to be responsible for program leadership, development, and coordination.

—Authorization for the Comptroller General to study alternatives to increase job opportunities for older persons in the executive branch through part-time employment and job redesign.

—Broad authority for DoL to conduct research and demonstration projects to focus on the special problems of mature workers.

Both the House and Senate approved the conference report for the now designated Employment and Manpower Act. President Richard M. Nixon vetoed the bill on December 16, 1970, raising strong objections to the public service provisions in the legislation. He also criticized the increased number of categorical programs in his veto message. President Nixon said, "The narrow categorical programs would continue to hamstring the efforts of communities to adjust to change in their local needs."[10] The Senate voted 48 to 35 to override the veto, but fell eight votes short of the constitutionally mandated two-thirds requirement.

The Special Subcommittee on Aging of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee conducted 3 days of hearings (April 4, 1970 and June 15–16, 1970) on S. 3604. Witnesses supported the legislation enthusiastically. However, there was insufficient time to advance the measure through the House and Senate before the 91st Congress adjourned.

---

[9] "Developments in Aging 1970", A Report of the Senate Committee on Aging, U.S. Senate, March 23, 1971, p. 94.

[10] "Developments in Aging 1970", A Report of the Senate Committee on Aging, U.S. Senate, March 23, 1971, p. 95.

2. *Action in 92nd Congress (1971-72):* Both Senators Kennedy and Randolph moved promptly to reintroduce their bills. Senator Kennedy sponsored S. 555 (OACSEA) on February 2, 1971. Senator Randolph introduced the Middle-Aged and Older Workers Employment Act (S.1307) on March 19, 1971.

The Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee on Aging (then, chaired by Thomas F. Eagleton, D-MO) held hearings in July 1971 on S. 555 and S. 1307.

Two developments occurred in 1971 which provided further impetus for the Congress to enact the OACSEA. First, President Nixon announced at the 1971 White House Conference on Aging that he would double the funding level for Mainstream's older worker component, from $13 million to $26 million. This action produced sizable funding increases for programs operated by the four existing sponsors (AARP, Green Thumb, NCOA, and NCSC) and also authorized the U.S. Forest Service and the Federation of Experienced Americans (FEA) to initiate Mainstream projects. The FEA contract was awarded in June 1972, and DoL later advised FAA in December 1973 that its Mainstream contract would not be renewed.

Some political analysts speculated that President Nixon made this recommendation because polls revealed that he and Senator Edmund S. Muskie (D-ME) (the Democratic front runner at that time) were locked in a close race. Congressional Democrats had also attacked President Nixon for his policies affecting older Americans, especially his recommendations for Social Security increases and funding proposals for the Older Americans Act and other programs affecting the aged.

Second, Kirschner Associates, Inc. gave a glowing assessment of the effectiveness of the Mainstream older worker programs:

> As earlier discussions of this report indicate, the need for programs such as OM (Operation Mainstream) is enormous and the program probably could be expanded 100-fold and not fulfill the need. Such a large-scale expansion, however, even if it were politically feasible, probably should not be undertaken rapidly. The program could be expanded immediately to several times its present size without creating any undue organizational or operating problems.
>
> It is also apparent that the particular national contractors involved are appropriate for the program and have demonstrated a capability to minister effectively the needs of both older enrollees and communities served. Thus, it is recommended that: *the proposed older worker program be continued to operate under the direction of NCSC, NCOA, NRTA, and the National Farmers Union.*[11]

The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee approved S. 555 and S. 1307 on June 21, 1972. The Senate unanimously passed (77 to 0) S. 555 on September 21, 1972.

Both bills were later added to S. 4044 (the 1972 Older Americans Services Amendments), which amended the Older Americans Act and other legislation. S. 555 became Title IX of S. 4044, and S. 1307

[11] "Final Report: National Evaluation of Operation Mainstream, A Public Service Employment Program", Kirchner Associates, Inc., December 1971, pp. 156-7.

became Title X (the short title of the legislation was changed to the Middle-Aged and Older Workers Training Act).

This strategy was adopted, in part, to enable Senator Eagleton to manage only one major bill on the Senate floor, rather than three measures—the Older Americans Act Amendments, S. 555, and S. 1307. During part of this period, Senator Eagleton was Senator George McGovern's (D–SD) Vice Presidential nominee.

The Senate unanimously passed (89 to 0) S. 4044 on October 3, 1972. The House earlier approved (351 to 3) the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments on July 17, 1972, but without the SCSEP or the Middle-Aged and Older Workers Training Act.

House and Senate conferees later agreed to the Senate provisions for creating a SCSEP and a modified version of the Midcareer Development Services program.

President Nixon pocket vetoed H.R. 15657 on October 30, 1972. Congress had no opportunity to pass the legislation without the President's signature, since the veto occurred after adjournment. President Nixon gave three reasons for opposing the bill:

1. The authorized funding was too high and could not be used effectively and responsibly;
2. The bill contained measures which would duplicate existing programs and activities; and
3. He opposed the OACSEA (Title IX) and the Midcareer Development Services program (Title X).

3. *Enactment in 1973:* Senator Eagleton reintroduced the Older Americans Comprehensive Services Amendments (S. 50) on January 4, 1973. S. 50 was the same bill that President Nixon had pocket vetoed during the preceding Congress (92nd Congress). It included both the Title IX OACSEA and the Title X Midcareer Development Services program. S. 50 attracted broad bipartisan support. Eventually, 66 Senators joined Eagleton in sponsoring the measure. The impressive listing of cosponsors also sent a signal to the Nixon White House that the Senate had the necessary two-thirds vote to override a veto.

Congressman John Brademas (D–IN) sponsored similar legislation (H.R. 71) on January 3, 1973. H.R. 71 included the Title IX OACSEA, but not the Title X Midcareer Development Services program.

The Senate easily passed S. 50 (by a vote of 82 to 9) on February 20, 1973. However, the crucial vote came on Senator J. Glenn Beall's (R–MD) motion to recommit S. 50 with instructions to delete Title IX and Title X. The Senate rejected the Beall motion by a vote of 26 to 64. This vote was another solid indication that the Senate had more than enough votes to override a veto if the President should choose this course of action again.

H.R. 71 passed the House on March 13, 1973 by a vote of 329 to 69. House and Senate conferees now had to resolve differences in S. 50 and H.R. 71.

Title IX's existence was secure, since it was in both S. 50 and H.R. 71. Senate conferees later agreed to drop Title X from the conference bill to win the support of Congressman Albert H. Quie (R–

MN), the ranking Republican on the Education and Labor Committee.

During this period, President Nixon became politically crippled because of the revelations about the Watergate scandal. This development clearly placed Congress in a stronger position to dictate more of the terms for enactment of the 1973 Older Americans Comprehensive Services Amendments.

S. 50 became law (Public Law 93-29) on May 3, 1973. Aging advocates now had won the first battle in providing a statutory basis for the SCSEP. S. 50 represented the first pocket vetoed measure during the 92nd Congress to become law during the 93rd Congress.

Title X did not become law. However, Senator Randolph later added key features of Title X as amendments to S. 1559, which eventually became the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA). The Senate passed S. 1559 on July 24, 1973. The House approved similar legislation (H.R. 11010) on November 28, 1973.

House and Senate conferees later agreed to the Randolph amendments in modified form. Both the House and Senate adopted the conference report for S. 1559 on December 20, 1973. President Nixon signed S. 1559, along with the Randolph amendments, into law (Public Law 93-203) on December 28, 1973. The Randolph amendments authorized funding for special employment services for middle-aged and older workers, including placement, recruitment, and counseling for unemployed persons because of a plant shutdown or other permanent large scale reduction in the work force. CETA also authorized DoL to make grants or enter into agreements with prime sponsors to help middle-aged and older workers obtain part-time or temporary employment.

F. Appropriations Issues

The authorization struggle represented the first hurdle for the SCSEP. The appropriations arena represented another potential battleground.

Congress kept the program alive initially by insisting on appropriations when no funds were requested. Throughout its history, the SCSEP has enjoyed solid bipartisan support in Congress. One measure of that success is the impressive growth in the program, even during austere budgetary periods.

Currently, the Title V SCSEP is funded at $331.260 million for fiscal year 1988. Title V differs from most other programs in that its funding cycle is from July 1 to June 30 (rather than from October 1 to September 30) because it is forward funded by 9 months.

Public Law 100-436, the Fiscal Year 1989 Labor-Health and Human Services (HHS)-Education Appropriations Act (H.R. 4783), includes $343.824 million for the Title V SCSEP. This measure will become effective for the SCSEP on July 1, 1989. At that time, Title V funding will increase by $333.824 million since the SCSEP was first funded in fiscal year 1974—more than a 33-fold within a span of just 15 years.

The funding table below traces the generally steady and impressive growth in the SCSEP in terms of participation by older enrollees and overall funding. The number of employment positions has increased from 3,800 in fiscal year 1974 to 64,813 for fiscal year

1988. Beginning July 1, 1989, the number of positions is expected to grow to 65,804. Many more low income older Americans actually participate in the SCSEP because more than 20 percent of the average enrollment is transitioned into unsubsidized employment. This development opens the door for more persons to enroll in the program. Moreover, Title V can provide temporary employment for older persons when a position is available on a shorter-term basis.

Increased appropriations for the SCSEP enabled DoL to fund three national minority sponsors in 1978: National Caucus and Center on Black Aged, National Association of Hispanic Elderly (Asociacion Nacional Pro Personas Mayores), and National Urban League. States were first funded in 1976.

Older Americans Act Title V Senior Community Service Employment Program: Authorizations, Appropriations, and Number of Employment Positions (Dollars in Millions)

Fiscal Year/Program Year July 1—June 30	Authorization	Appropriation		Program Yr Enrollment Positions
		Fiscal Yr	Program Yr	
1974	60.000	10.000	.....	3,800
1975 (1975–76)[a]	100.000	12.000	(42.000)	12,400
1976 (1976–77)[a]	[b]137.500	85.900	(55.900)	15,000
1977 (1977–78)	150.000	150.000	(150.000)	37,400
1978 (1978–79)	200.000	211.700	[c](200.900)	47,500
1979 (1979–80)	350.000	220.600	[d](229.176)	52,250
1980 (1980–81)	400.000	266.900	[d](258.324)	52,250
1981 (1981–82)	450.000	277.100	(277.100)	54,216
1982 (1982–83)	[e]277.100	277.100	(277.100)	54,216
1983 (1983–84)	[e]296.500	319.450	(319.450)	62,502
1984 (1984–85)	[e]317.300	317.300	(317.300)	62,080
1985 (1985–86)	335.000	326.000	(326.000)	63,783
1986 (1986–87)	351.400	312.002	[f](312.002)	61,045
1987 (1987–88)	368.300	336.000	(336.000)	65,741
1988 (1988–89)	386.715	331.260	(331.260)	64,813
1989 (1989–90)	406.051	343.824	(343.824)	65,804

[a] Funding in fiscal year (FY) 1976 included $30 million in a continuing resolution and $55.9 million under the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, producing a total of $85.9 million. Title V was placed on a 9-month forward funding basis during the 1976–77 period. The $42 million funding for the 1975–76 program year (PY) included a $12-million appropriation for FY 1975 and $30 million in a FY 1976 continuing resolution.

[b] This includes $100 million for the period ending June 30, 1976 and $37.5 million for the transition quarter July 1, 1976 to June 30, 1976.

[c] Funding for FY 1978 amounted to $211.7 million. This included a $21.3 million supplemental appropriation, but $10.8 million was rescinded.

[d] The 1979 funding level included $8.576 million from the FY 1980 appropriation.

[e] The authorization also provided such sums as may be necessary to maintain at least 54,200 part-time employment positions.

[f] This reflected a $13.998 million reduction to comply with the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings amendment in Public Law 99–177.

NOTE: Much of the information for this funding table is included in "Title V of the Older Americans Act—Community Service Employment for Older Americans: Program, Description, and Legislative History", by Carol O'Shaughnessy, Specialist in Social Legislation, Education and Public Welfare Division, Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, Rept. No. 85–155 Gov., HD 7106 C, July 19, 1985.

G. ISSUES DURING THE 1980's

Since its enactment in 1973, the underlying principles for the SCSEP have remained in place. Congress has enacted some modifications, but Title V's fundamental thrust has remained essentially unchanged.

For example, the 1981 Older Americans Act Amendments (Public Law 97–115) dropped the requirement in the original legislation that low-income older persons must have "poor employment prospects". It also removed from the definition of "eligible individual" that this person must "have difficulty in securing employment". A

major purpose for these changes was to focus Title V more on assisting older individuals who are capable of employment but may have difficulty in entering or reentering the labor force because of their age or vocation.

These changes, though, have not prevented SCSEP sponsors from reaching out and serving persons with poor employment prospects because of limited education or other limitations. Title V sponsors still continue to assist individuals who would have difficulty in securing employment on their own, such as an elderly widow with outmoded work skills who has not been in the labor force for many years.

A number of proposals were offered by the Administration during the 1980's which would have fundamentally altered the basic concept of the SCSEP. The Administration proposed in 1981 a 1-year authorization for Title V (rather than a 3-year extension as for other Older Americans Act programs) in order to permit a review of all employment and training programs, which were scheduled for reauthorization in fiscal year 1982. Congress opted for a 3-year extension of the SCSEP and for practically all other Older Americans Act programs and activities.

A fiscal year 1983 budget proposal would have terminated funding for Title V as a separate program. Instead, the SCSEP would have been folded into a new Special Targeted Program which would have served several clients, including displaced homemakers, migrants, Indians, and older workers. The Special Targeted Program would concentrate on training without the subsidized wages under the SCSEP. Moreover, the overall funding for the Special Targeted Program was less than the appropriation for Title V. Congress dismissed this proposal.

In June 1983, the Administration proposed to replace Title V with a new Title III-D Employment Opportunities Program under the Older Americans Act. States would have operated this new program through area agencies on aging. Additionally, this measure would have provided funds to low-income older persons to begin their own businesses. Congress did act on this proposal.

A fiscal year 1985 budget recommendation would have shifted the State-administered SCSEP from DoL to HHS. Congress also rejected this proposal.

CHAPTER TWO

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SCSEP

Throughout its history, the SCSEP has served some of the most disadvantaged persons in our entire society, particularly those with poverty incomes, limited educational attainment, and minorities.

Enrollment in the SCSEP is targeted to low-income persons (income below 125 percent of the poverty threshold) 55 years of age or older. The subsequent table illustrates the income eligibility standards for enrollees residing in continental United States, Alaska, and Hawaii.

1988 Income Eligibility Standards for the SCSEP

Size of Family	Continental United States	Alaska	Hawaii
1 person	$7,213	$9,013	$8,313
2 persons	9,663	12,075	11,125

The following summarizes the major characteristics of Title V enrollees during the 1987–88 program year and during the 1980's.

Sex: Nearly 7 out of every 10 enrollees were women (69.1 percent), and 3 out of every 10 were men (30.9 percent) during the 1987–88 program year. This pattern has not changed much during the 1980's, ranging from 65.9 percent female during the 1982–83 program year to 69.4 percent during the 1980–81 program year.

Minorities: Nearly 3 out of every 8 (37.2 percent) enrollees were members of minority groups. The proportion of minority participants has grown steadily, from 32.7 percent during the 1980–81 program year to 37.2 percent for the most recent period.

Minority Representation in Title V SCSEP During 1987–88 Program Year

Minority Group	Percent
Blacks	23.8
Hispanics	8.7
Asians and Pacific Islanders	3.2
Native Americans	1.5
Total Minorities	37.2

Poverty status: About 4 out of 5 (80.4 percent) of the enrollees had incomes below the poverty guidelines for the 1987–88 program year. The highest proportion occurred during 1980–81 when 85.6 percent of the participants were poor. All enrollees were certified as having incomes below 125 percent of the poverty threshold.

1988 Poverty Thresholds for the SCSEP

Size of Family	Continental United States	Alaska	Hawii
1 person	$5,770	$7,210	$6,650
2 persons	7,730	9,660	8,900

Education: Most enrollees had limited education—83 percent did not attend college, 49.1 percent did not graduate from high school, and 27.8 percent completed less than 9 years of schooling. The proportion of the most educationally disadvantaged enrollees—those with under 9 years of schooling—has declined steadily during the 1980's, from 36.5 percent for the 1980–81 program year to 27.8 percent for the 1987–88 program year. This trend reflects a generally increasing level of educational attainment among older Americans.

Educational Levels for Enrollees in SCSEP During 1987–88 Program Year

Years of Schooling	Percentage of Enrollees
Less than 9	27.8
9–11	21.3
12	33.9
College 1–3	11.9
College 4 or more	5.1

Age: More than one-half (51.4 percent of the enrollees were 65 years of age or older during 1987–88, and one-fourth (26.3 percent) were 70 or older. These proportions have remained fairly consistent throughout this decade. For example, 25.7 percent of the participants were 70 or older during the 1980–81 program year, and 52.9 percent were 65-plus years of age.

• Age of SCSEP Enrollees During 1987–88 Program Year

Age	Percent of Enrollees
55–59	20.0
60–64	28.6
65–69	25.1
70–74	15.6
75+	10.7

Veterans: The percentage of enrollees who are veterans has generally increased during the 1980's, from 9.0 percent during the 1980–81 program year to 14.0 percent during 1987–88. This represents a 55.6-jump increase in the participation rate for older veterans.

Unsubsidized placements: Unsubsidized placements have nearly doubled during this decade for all sponsors, from 11.2 percent during 1980–81 to 22.0 percent during 1987–88. National sponsors had a 22.9-percent unsubsidized placement rate for the 1987–88 pro-

gram year (11.0 percent for 1980–81), and States had an 18.3 percent rate (10.4 percent for 1980–81).

Administrative costs: Historically, the SCSEP has had low administrative costs, ranging from 10.3 percent to 11.1 percent for all sponsors throughout the 1980's. During 1987–88 program year, administrative costs were 10.6 percent of program costs. Administrative costs were 10.5 percent for national contractors and 11.0 percent for States for 1987–88.

CHAPTER THREE

ASSESSMENT OF THE SCSEP

The SCSEP and its predecessor—the Mainstream Older Worker pilot project—have been evaluated on numerous occasions. Both programs always received high marks, whether from independent evaluators, elderly participants, host agencies, or others.

The following quotes illustrate the strong support and respect that the SCSEP and the Mainstream Older Worker pilot project have enjoyed throughout their existence.

Elderly Participants

Community service employment has enabled numerous low-income older Americans to help themselves while helping others in their communities at the same time. An 88-year-old man told a Senate panel that he got rid of his "two boys" after joining the Green Thumb program:

> Those two boys left me, and the name of the first one was Arthur and the second one was Ritus. You put them together, and it meant arthritis was in my arms.
>
> At my age, I believe that Green Thumb is the reason I am living today. If it hadn't been for Green Thumb, I believe I would have faded away.[1]

Another elderly gentleman found new meaning in retirement after working as a Senior AIDE (funded by the Mainstream Older Worker pilot program) at a marine museum in Massachusetts:

> . . . I knew when I got up in the morning it was going to be a repetition of the day before. It was not very pleasant to know it was the same thing all over again.
>
> But since being down to the museum that all has changed, I know when I get up in the morning I have some place to go to.[2]

Host Agencies

Representatives from host agencies have also enthusiastically praised the work of older enrollees, and quite often have asked for more senior "aides". A typical example is this testimony provided by a supervisor at a day nursery in New Bedford, MA:

> Not only are they dependable, but they give of themselves in service. The job is a rewarding experience; not just a duty. And the reward is reciprocal.
>
> It seems as though the young, or the activity of a new endeavor, has a certain effect on the older adult. They seem to have gained a sense of confidence, satisfaction, and security from their jobs; but what is important—they have discovered

---

[1] Testimony by Reddrick Strickland, Newport News, VA, "Older American Community Service Employment Act" hearings, Special Subcommittee on Aging, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Washington, DC, p. 173, June 15, 1970.

[2] Testimony by John O'Keefe, Fall River, MA, hearings cited in footnote 1, Fall River, MA, p. 18, April 4, 1970.

that they have talents that are marketable, and what is yet more important they, the senior aides, are vitally needed.[3]

Independent Evaluators

Independent evaluators have likewise concluded that Title V is an effective program that works well for older enrollees, the agencies that they serve, and our Nation.

Federal Council on the Aging Report: The Comprehensive Older Americans Act Amendments of 1978 directed the Federal Council on Aging (FCA) to undertake a thorough evaluation and study of Older Americans Act programs, including the SCSEP. The FCA concluded that Title V is effective and fulfills three major purposes: (1) It provides employment and income for eligible workers, (2) offers training for individuals to obtain unsubsidized employment, and (3) delivers a wide range of community services. The FCA recommended that "The Title V Program should be continued and expanded in its present form".[4]

Morgan Management Systems, Inc. Report for the FCA: Morgan Management Systems, Inc. assisted the FCA by preparing a report on the SCSEP. The report concluded that Title V's basic objectives were fulfilled.

> The Title V program effectively provides community service employment for many truly needy persons. The program operates efficiently and its administrative expenses are low. The services performed by the enrollees, by all reports, are valuable contributions to the general community and to the elderly community. The program provides income to many persons who would otherwise require public assistance.[5]

Solomon G. Jacobson, Vice President of Morgan Management Systems, Inc., gave the highest marks possible to Title V. He told a House Congressional unit: "The Senior Community Service Employment Program is the most effective program I have ever evaluated, and in my opinion it should be retained and strengthened."[6]

General Accounting Office (GAO) Study: GAO reviewed four quantifiable goals in the authorizing Act and regulations—participant eligibility, administrative and matching costs, transitioning participants to private sector jobs, and utilizing funds to enroll the maximum number of older persons. GAO concluded that these objectives were fulfilled, stating:

> Program data indicate that SCSEP has produced some positive results in that certain key program objectives have been met. Although the administration believes a transfer of the program will increase the effectiveness and coordination of operations, there have been no studies or analyses to support this belief. In this regard, neither our survey nor other studies have

---

[3] Testimony by Eleanor Morton, Supervisor, West End Nursery of New Bedford, Inc., New Bedford, MA, hearing cited in footnote 1, Fall River, MA, p. 31, April 4, 1970.

[4] "Older Americans Act Programs", The Federal Council on the Aging, p. 16, March 27, 1981.

[5] An Evaluation of the Performance of the Senior Community Service Employment Program, Title V of the Older Americans Act, Morgan Management Systems, Inc., p. 11, March 1981.

[6] Testimony by Solomon G. Jacobson, "The Older Americans Act and the Fiscal Year 1984 Budget", Subcommittee on Human Services, House Committee on Aging, p. ————————, February 23, 1983.

indicated that there are any serious problems with SCSEP operations. In addition, the administration did not provide any specifics on the program changes that would occur if the program was transferred to AoA [Administration on Aging].[7]

Centaur Associates, Inc. Study: A 1986 Centaur Associates, Inc. report found a high degree of satisfaction among older enrollees and host agencies. Some enrollees, though, expressed dissatisfaction with the number of hours (generally, 20 hours per week) and the pay (typically, at or near the minimum wage). Similarly, some host agencies complained about the limited number of hours that enrollees were allowed to work. Centaur Associates, Inc. gave this assessment:

> Participants reported a very high degree of overall satisfaction with the program. Over 90 percent of survey respondents reported to have been satisfied with their program experiences . . . .
>
> Host agencies were overwhelmingly satisfied with all aspects of their association with SCSEP including the local project administration and the enrollees they were assigned.[8]

The Centaur Associates report concluded that coordination between local SCSEP projects and other employment and training activities is generally informal. The strongest linkage is between SCSEP projects and the local employment service. This takes the form of referrals of ineligible SCSEP applicants to the local employment service, the placement of enrollees as older worker specialists in local offices, and other activities.

Coordination between Title V projects and Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) is less developed. In part, this may be because the JTPA was still relatively new when Centaur Associates conducted the study for DoL.

Linkages with other education and training programs (e.g., vocational education) is based largely on referrals. Some training, though, is provided to a limited number of enrollees through these programs.

Borzilleri Study for American Association of Retired Persons: Thomas C. Borzilleri, a Senior Staff Economist for the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP), conducted a performance study of AARP's SCSEP. He concluded that Title V can produce tax savings because older enrollees often leave the food stamp or Supplemental Security Income rolls after they participate in the SCSEP and then become employed in the private sector and independent of Federal support. Borzilleri calculated the savings in this manner:

> . . . An ex-enrollee returns $1,039 more in tax revenue to all units of government, and $390 more in tax revenue to the Federal Government, than it costs in tax revenue to find him or her a permanent job. The placement of an enrollee in a permanent job yields a rate of return to all taxpayers of approxi-

---

[7] "Information on the Senior Community Service Employment Program And The Proposed Transfer To The Department of Health and Human Services", GAO/HRD 84-42, pp. 11-12, March 12, 1984.

[8] "Evaluation Study Of The Senior Community Service Employment Program Funded Under Title V Of The Older Americans Act", Centaur Associates, Inc., p. viii, July 25, 1986.

mately 16 percent per year and to the Federal Government of approximately 6 percent.[9]

[9] "Title IX and the Older Worker: A Performance Study", National Retired Teachers Association-American Association of Retired Persons, p. 7, February 15, 1978.

APPENDIX

Appendix A. Year Current Sponsors Were First Funded Under Either Operation Mainstream of the SCSEP

Sponsor	Year First Awarded Funds
Green Thumb (National Farmers Union)	1965
National Council on the Aging	1968
National Council of Senior Citizens	1968
American Association of Retired Persons	1969
U.S. Forest Service	1972
National Association for Hispanic Elderly (Asociacion Nacional Pro Personas Mayores)	1978
National Caucus and Center on Black Aged	1978
National Urban League	1978
States	1976

Appendix B. Legislation Creating or Amending the SCSEP

Short Title	Public Law	Year
Older Americans Comprehensive Services Amendments of 1973 [1]	93-29	1973
Older Americans Amendments of 1975	94-135	1975
Comprehensive Older Americans Act Amendments of 1978 [2]	95-478	1978
Older Americans Act Amendments of 1981	97-115	1981
Older Americans Act Amendments of 1984	98-459	1984
Older Americans Act Amendments of 1987	100-175	1987

[1] The Older American Community Service Employment Act was included as Title IX in the Older Americans Comprehensive Services Amendments of 1973.

[2] The Older American Community Service Employment Act was redesignated as Title V of the Older Americans Act in the Comprehensive Older Americans Act Amendments of 1978.

92-198 (32)